

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are the claims currently pending in the Application.

Claim 3 is amended to clarify features recited thereby.

Formal Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority and the receipt of the priority document.

Further, Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging review and consideration of the reference cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed July 11, 2003.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being obvious over Laurent, U. S. Patent No. 6,717,865 and the Applicant's admitted prior art, Specification, page 1 (hereinafter: "AAPA"). This rejection is traversed.

Among the problems recognized and solved by Applicant's claimed invention is that of providing a more convenient apparatus and method for detecting a clock signal anomaly by detecting a potential on the bit line.¹ According to an aspect of Applicant's claimed invention, a clock signal anomaly is determined based on a potential on a bit line that is detected after a precharge. The prior art, including Laurent and

¹ The problems and solution herein discussed are intended only to illustrate aspects of Applicant's claimed invention. Applicant does not represent that every embodiment of

Applicant's admitted prior art does not disclose or suggest this problem, let alone disclose or suggest the solutions provided by Applicants claimed invention.

For at least the following reasons, Applicant's claimed invention is neither anticipated by, nor obvious from, Laurent and the AAPR. By way of example, independent claims 1 and 5 require resetting the operation of the CPU when the potential on the bit line has not reached a predetermined potential.

Laurent discloses monitoring voltage levels to ensure that they are maintained close to their predetermined values (Laurent, column 2, lines 1-7), and test circuitry that is simplified to accomplish this goal.

Laurent does not disclose or suggest resetting the operation of the CPU based on the potential detected on the bit line. The Examiner acknowledges that Laurent does not disclose these features, however the Examiner alleges that the AAPR, Applicant's disclosure page 1, discloses these features.

The cited AAPR discloses a data processor in which whether the clock signal falls within a predetermined range of frequencies is determined using a frequency detector circuit composed of a capacitor and a resistor. Neither Laurent nor the AAPR discloses or suggests resetting the operation of the CPU based on a potential on the bit line. Clearly, Laurent and the AAPR do not disclose or suggest resetting the operation of the CPU when the potential on a bit line has not reached a predetermined potential, as *inter alia*, required by independent claims 1 and 5. Therefore, Laurent and the AAPR,

Applicant's claimed invention necessarily embodies or performs the solutions herein identified.

even taken in a combination as a whole, do not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims 1 and 5.

Claims 2 and 6 depend from independent claims 1 and 5, respectively, and thus incorporate novel and nonobvious features thereof. Therefore, claims 2 and 6 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that independent claims 1 and 5 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 4 are Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Laurent. This rejection is traversed.

Independent claim 3 requires, *inter alia*, signaling a clock signal anomaly when the potential on the bit line has not reached the predetermined potential. Laurent and the APPR, even if taken together as a whole, do not disclose signaling a clock signal anomaly based on a potential on the bit line. Clearly, Laurent and the AAPR do not disclose or suggest signaling a clock signal anomaly when the potential on a bit line has not reached a predetermined potential, as *inter alia*, required by independent claim 3.

Claim 4 depends from independent claim 3, and thus incorporates novel and nonobvious features thereof. Therefore, claim 4 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that independent claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable, and respectfully requests that the

Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


George Brieger
Registration No. 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343 Ext. 503

GB:eg